

REMARKS

The Official Action dated October 31, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 1, 21, 27 and 29 have been amended in order to better define that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 21-32 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicant wishes to acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 6 of the Office Action that claims 27-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of claims 27 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 21 as well as the intervening claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of now independent claims 27 and 29 as well as those claims which depend therefrom are now in proper condition for allowance.

Further, it is noted that the Examiner indicates that independent claims 1 and 21 would likewise be allowable if rewritten to include particular limitations. That is, the Examiner indicates that independent claim 1 would be allowable if amended to recite that the current source is connected directly to the common node and that independent claim 21 would likewise be allowable if it were amended to recite that the first transistor is connected directly to the first node. Again, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include the limitations suggested by the Examiner. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 1 and 21 as well as those claims which depend therefrom are likewise believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

With reference now to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,448,848 issued to Altmann. This rejection is respectfully traversed in that the patent to Altmann neither discloses nor suggests that which is presently set forth by Applicant's claimed invention.

Again, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to include limitations suggested by the Examiner in order to place such claims in proper condition for allowance. Accordingly, as appreciated by the Examiner, the patent to Altmann neither discloses nor suggests a differential driver having two output terminals, a common node as well as a current source connected directly to the common node and supplying a first current to the common node as recited in independent claim 1 nor does the patent to Altmann disclose a differential current driver comprising a first transistor connected directly to a first node as is now set forth in independent claim 21. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 1 and 21 as well as those claims which depend therefrom clearly distinguish over the teachings of Altmann and are in proper condition for allowance.

With respect to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, claims 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann in view of either Watarai or Wu while claims 23-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Altmann when taken alone. Each of these rejections are respectfully traversed in that the patent to Altmann when taken alone or in view of the teachings of Watarai or Wu neither disclose nor suggest that which is presently set forth by Applicant's claimed invention.

Again, in that each of claims 23-26 and 30-32 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 21 include all the limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that each of these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance for the reasons discussed hereinabove.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-3 and 21-32 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000